



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

grb
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,320	01/23/2004	Dean W. Bergstrom	SLA.1276	8176
55376	7590	02/07/2007	EXAMINER	
ROBERT D. VARITZ 4915 S.E. 33RD PLACE PORTLAND, OR 97202			LONG, ANDREA NATAE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/764,320	BERGSTROM ET AL.
	Examiner Andrea N. Long	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/23/2004

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7 have been examined in response to application filed 01/23/2004.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Throughout the specification, which it to include the abstract, summary of the invention, detailed description of the preferred embodiment, and the claims, the term database has been used interchangeably as "data base" or "database". For purposes of consistency the term should be limited to either "data base" or "database". The Examiner will be using the term "database" throughout the Specification.

The word "filed" on page 3, line 14 of the specification should be changed to "field".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 1, 4, and 6, the phrase "data field in a enhanced" should recite "data field in an enhanced".

As to claims 2, 4, and 7, the phrase "manipulations the font" should recite "manipulating the font".

As to claim 4, the phrase "including includes inserting an", should recite "includes inserting an".

For purposes of examination, the pending claims have been examined to reflect the corrections of the objections. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2, 4, 5, and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claims 2, 4, and 6, it is unclear to the examiner how *inserting an image into the data field, manipulating the font of the data field, including presenting the font in bold, italic, underlined, in reverse video, with a color change, changing the fonts, using reserved characters, and providing a graphic mixed with a text, can be implemented at one time on a field or information contained within the field.* The specification sheds no light at least in the specification, but not limited to the specification of the claimed subject matter. For the purposes of examining, the following claims are rejected under

a possible interpretation of "*inserting an image into the data field, manipulating the font of the data field, including presenting the font in bold, italic, underlined, in reverse video, with a color change, changing the fonts, using reserved characters, or providing a graphic mixed with a text*", which is consistent with the Applicant's specification, page 4 lines 19-21.

As to claim 5, it is rejected as inheriting the deficiencies of independent claim 4.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

As to claims 2, 4, and 6, it is unclear to the examiner how *inserting an image into the data field, manipulating the font of the data field, including presenting the font in bold, italic, underlined, in reverse video, with a color change, changing the fonts, using reserved characters, and providing a graphic mixed with a text*, can be implemented at one time on a field or information contained within the field. The specification sheds no light at least in the specification, but not limited to the specification of the claimed subject matter. For the purposes of examining, the following claims are rejected under a possible interpretation of "*inserting an image into the data field, manipulating the font of the data field, including presenting the font in bold, italic, underlined, in reverse video, with a color change, changing the fonts, using reserved characters, or providing a*

graphic mixed with a text, which is consistent with the Applicant's specification, page 4 lines 19-21.

7. Independent claims 1, 4, and 6 recite the limitation "the database" in first and second lines of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Independent claim 1 recites the limitation "the group" in the third line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims
As for dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 7, are rejected as inheriting the deficiencies of independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kulkarni (US Patent 5950193), hereinafter "Kulkarni" in view of Tolkin (Display value e.g. "Unknown" for a Null valued element, 02/17/2000), hereinafter "Tolkin" and further

in view of Cox et al (IBM TDB, Limited Space Entry-Field Control, 04/05/2005), hereinafter "IBM".

As to independent claim 1, Kulkarni teaches a method of providing a user interface for use with a database (column 1 lines 32-41), wherein the database includes plural records, each having plural data fields therein, wherein a data field contains information taken from the group of information types consisting of entered information (column 1 lines 42-52), empty, and null, wherein empty and null data fields comprise blank data fields (column 2 lines 20-23), comprising:

displaying a selected record according to a display protocol (Fig. 2). However Kulkarni does not teach determining if display protocol requires display of a blank data field and displaying a substitute data field. Tolkin teaches determining if the display protocol requires display of a blank data field of the record (paragraph [01]), and, if so, displaying a substitute data field, which is taken from the group of data fields consisting of system generated data fields and alternate data fields (paragraphs [01] through [06]). However, Kulkarni as modified by Tolkin does not teach displaying a substitute data field in an enhanced manner. IBM teaches wherein said displaying a substitute data field, includes displaying the information in the substitute data field in an enhanced manner to alert a user to the presence of the substitute information (paragraph [002]).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the database of Kulkarni with the determining of blank fields of

Tolkin in further view of the enhancing of IBM. Tolkin and IBM both express motivation for combining by stating when there is a null value we want the client tool to display an explicit value to represent this, rather than it being implied by the absence of an optional element (paragraph [01] of Tolkin), and to indicate that the entry field has no data (paragraph [002] of IBM).

As to dependent claim 2, IBM teaches wherein said displaying a substitute data field which is a system generated data field, includes presenting the font in italic (paragraph [002]).

As to dependent claim 3, Tolkin teaches wherein said displaying a substitute data field which is an alternate date field includes selecting a data field containing entered information and presenting the data field information to the user interface (paragraphs [04] through [06]).

As to independent claim 4, Kulkarni teaches a method of providing a user interface for use with a database (column 1 lines 32-41), wherein the database includes plural records, each having plural data fields therein, wherein a data field contains information taken from the group of information types consisting of entered information (column 1 lines 42-52), empty, and null, wherein empty and null data fields comprise blank data fields (column 2 lines 20-23), comprising:

displaying a selected record according to a display protocol (Fig. 2). However Kulkarni does not teach determining if display protocol requires display of a blank data field and displaying a substitute data field. Tolkin teaches determining if the display protocol requires display of a blank data field of the record (paragraph [01]), and, if so, displaying a substitute data field, which is taken from the group of data fields consisting of system generated data fields (paragraphs [01] through [06]). However, Kulkarni as modified by Tolkin does not teach manipulating the font of the field and displaying a substitute data field in an enhanced manner. IBM teaches manipulating the font and wherein said displaying a substitute data field, includes displaying the information in the substitute data field in an enhanced manner to alert a user to the presence of the substitute information (paragraph [002]).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the database of Kulkarni with the determining of blank fields of Tolkin in further view of the enhancing of IBM. Tolkin and IBM both express motivation for combining by stating when there is a null value we want the client tool to display an explicit value to represent this, rather than it being implied by the absence of an optional element (paragraph [01] of Tolkin), and to indicate that the entry field has no data (paragraph [002] of IBM).

As to dependent claim 5, Tolkin teaches wherein said displaying a substitute data field, which is an alternate data field includes selecting a data field containing

entered information and presenting that data field information to the user interface (paragraphs [04] through [06]).

As to independent claim 6, Kulkarni teaches a method of providing a user interface for use with a database (column 1 lines 32-41), wherein the database includes plural records, each having plural data fields therein, wherein a data field contains information taken from the group of information types consisting of entered information (column 1 lines 42-52), empty, and null, wherein empty and null data fields comprise blank data fields (column 2 lines 20-23), comprising:

displaying a selected record according to a display protocol (Fig. 2);
selecting a data field containing entered information and presenting that data field information to the user interface (column 3 lines 41-46). However Kulkarni does not teach determining if display protocol requires display of a blank data field and displaying a substitute data field. Tolkin teaches determining if the display protocol requires display of a blank data field of the record (paragraph [01]), and, if so, displaying a substitute data field, which is taken from the group of data fields consisting of system generated data fields and alternate data fields (paragraphs [01] through [06]). However, Kulkarni as modified by Tolkin does not teach displaying a substitute data field in an enhanced manner. IBM teaches wherein said displaying a substitute data field, includes displaying the information in the substitute data field in an enhanced manner to alert a user to the presence of the substitute information (paragraph [002]).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the database of Kulkarni with the determining of blank fields of Tolkin in further view of the enhancing of IBM. Tolkin and IBM both express motivation for combining by stating when there is a null value we want the client tool to display an explicit value to represent this, rather than it being implied by the absence of an optional element (paragraph [01] of Tolkin), and to indicate that the entry field has no data (paragraph [002] of IBM).

As to dependent claim 7, IBM teaches wherein said displaying a substitute data field which is a system generated data field, includes presenting the font in italic (paragraph [002]).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record on Form PTO 892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
01/29/2007

William F. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER